



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/661,103	09/12/2003	Parminder Singh	68009-8008.US03	6566
79975	7590	08/11/2011	EXAMINER	
King & Spalding LLP P.O. Box 889 Belmont, CA 94002-0889			GHALI, ISIS A D	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1611	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			08/11/2011	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

DETAILED ACTION

The receipt is acknowledged of applicants' response to the non-final office action mailed 03/07/2011 and IDS, both filed 06/03/2011.

Claims 1-38 and 40-60 are pending and included in the prosecution.

Rejections and/or objections not reiterated from previous office actions are hereby withdrawn. The following rejections and/or objections are either reiterated or newly applied. They constitute the complete set presently being applied to the instant application.

Double Patenting

1. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140

F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

2. Claims 1-38 and 40-60 are provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 56, 57, 59, 61, and 85-107 of copending Application No. 10/137,664 in view of Tapolsky et al. (WO 99/55312, currently provided). The present claims and the claims of the copending application both recite composition comprising water-swellaable polymer, a blend of and hydrophilic polymer and complementary oligomer, and active agent. The difference between the present claims and the copending claims is that the copending claims do not recite erodible backing layer. Tapolsky teaches device to provide treatment to a

Art Unit: 1611

localized site in the oral cavity comprising erodible backing. The residence time of the device can be adjusted by adjusting the polymer components of the backing depending on the desired timing of the delivery of the chosen pharmaceutical (abstract; page 9, lines 12-31). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to provide composition comprising water swellable polymer, blend of hydrophilic polymer and complementary polymer, and active agent as claimed by the copending application, and further add erodible backing taught by Tapolsky. One would have been motivated to do so because Tapolsky teaches that the residence time of the device in the oral cavity can be adjusted by adjusting erodability of the backing depending on the desired timing of delivery of the chosen pharmaceutical. One would reasonably expect formulating device comprising erodible backing and composition comprising water swellable polymer, blend of hydrophilic polymer and complementary polymer and active agent as instantly claimed, wherein the erodability of the backing layer can be adjusted depending on the desired timing of the delivery of the chosen pharmaceutical.

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection.

Response to Arguments

3. Applicant's arguments filed 06/03/2022 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicants argue that the backing taught by Tapolsky erodes before the adhesive layer, exactly the opposite to the present claims.

In response to this argument, it is argued that Tapolsky clearly suggest backing layer that erodes before the adhesive layer and in another embodiment the backing layer will protect the adhesive layer and the adhesive layer will typically erodes first, page 10, lines 10-13. In considering the disclosure of the reference, it is proper to take into account not only the specific teachings of the reference but also the inferences which one skilled in the art would reasonably be expected to draw therefrom. *In re Preda*, 401 F.2d 825, 826, 159 USPQ 342, 344 (CCPA 1968). The rational to modify or to combine the prior art does not have to be expressly stated in the prior art; the rational may be expressly or impliedly contained in the prior art or it may be reasoned from knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. The reason or motivation to modify the reference may often suggest what the inventor has done, but for a different purpose or to solve different problem. It is not necessary that the prior art suggest the combination or modification to achieve the same advantage or result discovered by applicant. *In re Linter*, 458 F.2d 1013, 173 USPQ 560 (CCPA 1972).

4. Claims 1-38 and 40-60 are provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1, 2, 7-9,14-19, 21, 23-34, 36-40, 46, 53, 56-61 and 63-71 of copending Application No. 10/359,548 in view of Tapolsky et al. (WO 99/55312). The present claims and the claims of the copending application both recite composition comprising water-swellaable polymer, a blend of and hydrophilic polymer and complementary oligomer, and active agent. The difference between the present claims and the copending claims is that the copending

Art Unit: 1611

claims do not recite erodible backing layer. Tapolsky teaches device to provide treatment to a localized site in the oral cavity comprising erodible backing. The residence time of the device can be adjusted by adjusting the polymer components of the backing depending on the desired timing of the delivery of the chosen pharmaceutical (abstract; page 9, lines 12-31). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to provide composition comprising water swellable polymer, blend of hydrophilic polymer and complementary polymer, and active agent as claimed by the copending application, and further add erodible backing taught by Tapolsky. One would have been motivated to do so because Tapolsky teaches that the residence time of the device in the oral cavity can be adjusted by adjusting erodability of the backing depending on the desired timing of delivery of the chosen pharmaceutical. One would reasonably expect formulating device comprising erodible backing and composition comprising water swellable polymer, blend of hydrophilic polymer and complementary polymer and active agent as instantly claimed, wherein the erodability of the backing layer can be adjusted depending on the desired timing of the delivery of the chosen pharmaceutical.

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection.

Response to Arguments

5. Applicant's arguments filed 06/03/2011 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicants argue that the copending claims are directed to a liquid composition comprising polymer and solvent that forms hydrogel film upon application

Art Unit: 1611

to teeth and after evaporation of the solvent, and the film is insoluble or slowly soluble.

The liquid of the copending application cannot be combined with the erodible backing for Tapolsky to form a film.

In response to this argument, it is argued that product of the copending application forms hydrogel after application on the teeth, and can be covered by erodible backing for protection. The present claims do not recite formation of the backing layer before application to the teeth.

Copending Applications

6. Applicants must bring to the attention of the examiner, or other Office official involved with the examination of a particular application, information within their knowledge as to other copending United States applications, which are "material to patentability" of the application in question. MPEP 2001.06(b). See *Dayco Products Inc. v. Total Containment Inc.*, 66 USPQ2d 1801 (CA FC 2003).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

7. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

8. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

9. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of

Art Unit: 1611

the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

10. Claims 1-38, 40-41, 46-49 and 60 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tapolsky et al. (WO 99/55312, currently provided) in view of Roreger et al. (US 5,456,745, IDS filed 12/19/2003).

Applicant Claims

Applicants' claim 1 is directed to composition comprising:

(a) a hydrogel comprising:

- (i) a water-swellaable, water-insoluble polymer;
- (ii) a blend of a hydrophilic polymer with a complementary oligomer capable of hydrogen or electrostatic bonding to the hydrophilic polymer;
- and
- (iii) an active agent; and

(b) a backing member, where the backing member is comprised of a polymer composition that erodes in a moist environment at a slower rate than the hydrogel.

Determination of the Scope and Content of the Prior Art
(MPEP §2141.01)

Tapolsky teaches erodible pharmaceutical device for application to the mucosal surface, the device comprising one adhesive layer and non-adhesive backing layer. Upon application to the mucous surface the device adheres and provides localized delivery to the treatment site and surrounding tissues. The kinetics of erodability are easily adjusted by varying the layer numbers or components (abstract; page 20, lines 30-31). Both adhesive and backing layers are water soluble, i.e. erodible (page 5, lines 11-13). The adhesive layer comprises from 0.005 to about 20% active agent, polymer selected from cellulose derivatives, which is water swellable polymer, combined with polymer selected from polyacrylic acid or polyvinyl pyrrolidone, which is water soluble hydrophilic polymer (page 5, lines 20-27; page 10, line 14 till page 11 line 12; page 17, lines 25-28; examples 11 and 12). Table 1, page 27 teaches up to 10% PVP, and 0.05-20% water swellable cellulose derivatives, and 0.5-10% polyacrylic acid. The adhesive layer further comprises polyethylene glycol, dihydroxy-polyethylene glycol and butylene glycol up to 20%, all claimed as oligomer (page 13, lines 10-14; page 14, lines 21-24; page 20, lines 5-11). Oligomers taught by the reference are expected to have the capability of hydrogen and electrostatic bonding to the hydrophilic polymer since compounds and their properties are inseparable. The backing layer comprises hydroxyethyl cellulose, hydroxypropyl cellulose or hydroxypropylmethyl cellulose, polysaccharide, polyamino acid and their derivatives, and cellulose acetate (page 5, line 28 till page 6, line 13; page 12, lines 5-25; page 13, line 24). Both layers may contain

Art Unit: 1611

coloring agent, flavoring agent or preservatives (page 17, lines 28-30). Example 37 teaches gel composition. The device may be solid (page 8, line 10). The residence time of the device can be adjusted by adjusting the polymer components of the backing depending on the desired timing of the delivery of the chosen pharmaceutical and carrier (page 9, lines 12-31). The layers of device absorbs water (page 9, lines 26-29), i.e. capable to form hydrogel. The residence time is modulated between about few seconds to about few days, and preferably between 30 minutes and 24 hours, and more preferably between about 1 hour to about 8 hours (page 10, lines 1-6). The adhesive layer containing the active agent will erode first and the backing layer has slower erosion time as it provides protection to the drug containing layer (page 10, lines 7-13). The device may have additional layer to ensure unidirectional release of the active agent (page 19, lines 3-6).

**Ascertainment of the Difference Between Scope the Prior Art and the Claims
(MPEP §2141.012)**

Although Tapolsky teaches combination of polymers including water swellable polymer and hydrophilic polymer, and suggests oligomer, however the reference does not exemplify the oligomer in the composition. Tapolsky does not teach translucent composition as instantly claimed by claim 16.

Roreger teaches hydrophilic flexible gel film that exhibits mechanical stability in swollen condition and has a high water absorption capacity, handling stability and optimum skin and mucous membrane tolerance (col.2, lines 11-17; col.7, lines 25-28).

Art Unit: 1611

The high water absorption capacity reads on hydrogel. The film is transparent (col.12, lines 51-67). The gel film is suitable for delivery of pharmaceuticals and cosmetics to the mucous membrane of the buccal cavity including fluorides (abstract; col.1, lines 15-23; col.10, lines 61-65). The film can be used as a single layer. If applicable to the mucous membrane, the film may have a backing layer that can be resorbable (col.8, line 35; col.10, lines 54-60). Example 12 on column 14 of Roreger teaches gel film comprises the same water swellable water insoluble polymer disclosed by applicants in the present specification page 15 including Eudragit S 100 in amount of 7.5%, Eudragit E 100 in an amount of 7.5%, hydrophilic polymer polyvinylpyrrolidone (PVP) and oligomer propylene glycol. Roreger also teaches utilization of Eudragit L and Eudragit LS polymers (col.2, lines 50-67), and cellulose polymer containing cellulose acetate (col.2, lines 36-42). The gel film comprises back layer (col.6, lines 16-18).

Finding of Prima Facie Obviousness Rational and Motivation
(MPEP §2142-2143)

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to provide device for drug delivery to the mucosa and surrounding tissues comprises an erodible backing layer and layer comprising active agent in a polymer combination as taught by Tapolsky, and replace the polymer composition containing the active agent with the translucent composition taught by Roreger comprising water swellable polymer such as Eudragit E 100 or Eudragit S 100 , PVP and polyethylene glycol. One would have been motivated to do so because Roreger teaches that

Art Unit: 1611

combination of water swellable polymer, PVP and oligomer provides translucent flexible gel film that exhibits mechanical stability in swollen condition and has a high water absorption capacity, handling stability and optimum mucous membrane tolerance and capable of delivering of active agents to the buccal cavity including fluoride. One would reasonably expect formulating translucent gel/hydrogel composition comprises PVP, PEG and water swellable polymer wherein the composition suitable to deliver active agent including fluoride to the buccal cavity, and further the composition is stable in swollen condition and has a high water absorption capacity, handling stability and optimum mucous membrane tolerance.

Regarding the capability of the oligomer of hydrogen and electrostatic bonding to the hydrophilic polymer as claimed by claim 1, this is an intrinsic property since compounds and their properties are inseparable.

Regarding the specific materials of the backing as claimed by claims 9, 12, 13 and 15, applicants failed to show unexpected results obtained from the use of polyacrylate, starch or alginate over the cellulose derivatives or polyamino acids taught by Tapolsky.

Regarding the claimed amounts of the polymers and active agent as claimed by claims 18-26, Tapolsky and Roreger teach amounts overlapping with the claimed amounts. In the case where the claimed ranges "overlap or lie inside ranges disclosed by the prior art" a prima facie case of obviousness exists. **See MPEP 2144.05 [R-5].**

Absent any evidence to the contrary, and based upon the teachings of the prior art, there would have been a reasonable expectation of success in practicing the

Art Unit: 1611

instantly claimed invention. Therefore, the invention as a whole would have been prima facie obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made.

11. Claims 42-45, 50-59 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of Tapolsky in view of Roreger as applied to claims 1-38, 40-41, 46-49 and 60, and further in view of Ye et al. (WO 01/01958, currently provided).

Applicant Claims

Applicant s' claims 42-45 recite the active agent of claim 1 is a whitening agent.

Claim 50 is directed to a method for whitening teeth comprising:

applying to teeth in need of whitening a composition comprising:

(a) a hydrogel comprising: (i) a water-swellaable, water-insoluble polymer; (ii) a blend of a hydrophilic polymer with a complementary oligomer capable of hydrogen or electrostatic bonding to the hydrophilic polymer; and (iii) an active agent; and

(b) a backing member, where the backing member is comprised of a polymer composition that erodes in the oral cavity at a slower rate than the hydrogel.

Determination of the Scope and Content of the Prior Art

(MPEP §2141.01)

The combined teachings of Tapolsky and Roreger are previously discussed in this office action. The combined teachings of the references teaches composition comprising: (a) a hydrogel comprising: (i) a water-swellaable, water-insoluble polymer; (ii)

Art Unit: 1611

a blend of a hydrophilic polymer with a complementary oligomer capable of hydrogen or electrostatic bonding to the hydrophilic polymer; and (iii) an active agent; and (b) erodible backing member.

**Ascertainment of the Difference Between Scope the Prior Art and the Claims
(MPEP §2141.012)**

While the combination of the references teaches active agent in the device for delivery to the buccal cavity including fluoride, however, the references do not explicitly teach whitening agent as claimed by claims 42-45 or the method of whitening teeth as claimed by claim 50-59.

Ye teaches delivery device for delivering oral care agent to the oral cavity comprising removable backing layer and oral care composition to contact the oral surface. Ye teaches the removable backing layer has sufficient flexibility so as to be readily comfortable to the oral surface when placed therein. Ye teaches removable backing intended to include removal as a result of in-situ dissolution in the oral cavity without the need of manual peeling which is very convenient to the consumer and provides added safety during overnight use (abstract; page 7, lines 10-11, 31-35). Oral care composition comprises teeth whitening agents including peroxides, metal chlorites, perborates, percarbonates, peroxyacids and combination thereof. Peroxides include hydrogen peroxide, urea peroxide, calcium peroxide, and carbamide peroxide. Metal chlorites include sodium chlorite, calcium chlorite, magnesium chlorite, barium chlorite, potassium chlorite and lithium chlorite (page 14, lines 23-33). Oral care composition

Art Unit: 1611

comprises fluorides (page 16, lines 3-30). The reference teaches method of using the device comprising applying the device to the desired surface to obtain the desired effect such as whitening the teeth by applying the device to the desired area of the teeth surfaces (page 28, lines 12-28).

Finding of Prima Facie Obviousness Rational and Motivation

(MPEP §2142-2143)

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to provide device comprising erodible backing and gel/hydrogel composition comprises PVP, PEG and water swellable polymer wherein the composition suitable to deliver active agent including fluoride to the buccal cavity as taught by the combination of Tapolsky and Roreger, and replace the fluoride with teeth whitening agent and use the device for teeth whitening as taught by Ye. One would have been motivated to do so because Ye teaches that teeth whitening can be performed by using device having erodible backing applied to the surface of the teeth because such a device is very convenient to the consumer and provides added safety during overnight use. One would reasonably expect formulating device comprising erodible backing and composition comprising gel/hydrogel comprises PVP, PEG and water swellable polymer and teeth whitening agent wherein the device can be applied to the surface of the tooth to achieve whitening while being comfortable, convenient and safe to the consumer.

Regarding application of the composition and the backing in subsequent steps as claimed by claim 53, applicants failed to provide unexpected results obtained from subsequent application over the single step application taught by the prior art.

Regarding the predetermined period of time to achieve teeth whitening as claimed by claims 56-58, those of ordinary skill in the art would have been readily optimized the period of administration based on the dosages of whitening agent used. Doses and administration regimens can be determined by good medical practice and the clinical condition of the individual patient. Determination of the appropriate dosage for treatment involving the above mentioned formulation would have been routinely made by those of ordinary skill in the art and is within the ability of tasks routinely performed by them without undue experimentation.

One would have been motivated to combine these references and make the modification because they are drawn to same technical fields (constituted with same ingredients and share common utilities), and pertinent to the problem which applicant concerns about. MPEP 2141.01(a)

Absent any evidence to the contrary, and based upon the teachings of the prior art, there would have been a reasonable expectation of success in practicing the instantly claimed invention. Therefore, the invention as a whole would have been prima facie obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made.

12. Claims 50-59 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ye (WO 01/01958) in view of Tapolsky (WO 99/55312), both references are currently provided.

Applicant Claims

Claim 50 is directed to a method for whitening teeth comprising:

applying to teeth in need of whitening a composition comprising:

(a) a hydrogel comprising: (i) a water-swellaable, water-insoluble polymer; (ii) a blend of a hydrophilic polymer with a complementary oligomer capable of hydrogen or electrostatic bonding to the hydrophilic polymer; and (iii) an active agent; and

(b) a backing member, where the backing member is comprised of a polymer composition that erodes in the oral cavity at a slower rate than the hydrogel.

Determination of the Scope and Content of the Prior Art

(MPEP §2141.01)

Ye teaches delivery device for delivering oral care agent to the oral cavity comprising removable backing layer and oral care composition to contact the oral surface. Ye teaches the removable backing layer has sufficient flexibility so as to be readily comfortable to the oral surface when placed therein. Ye teaches removable backing intended to include removal as a result of in-situ dissolution in the oral cavity without the need of manual peeling which is very convenient to the consumer and provides added safety during overnight use (abstract; page 7, lines 10-11, 31-35). Oral care composition comprises teeth whiting agents including peroxides, metal chlorites,

Art Unit: 1611

perborates, percarbonates, peroxyacids and combination thereof. Peroxides include hydrogen peroxide, urea peroxide, calcium peroxide, and carbamide peroxide. Metal chlorites include sodium chlorite, calcium chlorite, magnesium chlorite, barium chlorite, potassium chlorite and lithium chlorite (page 14, lines 23-33). Oral care composition comprises fluorides (page 16, lines 3-30). The reference teaches method of using the device comprising applying the device to the desired surface to obtain the desired effect such as whitening the teeth by applying the device to the desired area of the teeth surfaces (page 28, lines 12-28).

**Ascertainment of the Difference Between Scope the Prior Art and the Claims
(MPEP §2141.012)**

Ye however, does not teach the composition containing the teeth whitening agent comprising water-swellaable, water-insoluble polymer; a blend of a hydrophilic polymer with a complementary oligomer capable of hydrogen or electrostatic bonding to the hydrophilic polymer as instantly claimed by claim 50.

Tapolsky teaches erodible pharmaceutical device for application to the buccal cavity, the device comprising one adhesive layer and non-adhesive backing layer. Upon application to the mucous surface the device adheres and provides localized delivery to the treatment site and surrounding tissues. The kinetics of erodability of the backing layer are easily adjusted by varying the layer numbers or components (abstract; page 20, lines 30-31). Both adhesive and backing layers are water soluble, i.e. erodible (page 5, lines 11-13). The adhesive layer comprises active agent, one polymer selected from

Art Unit: 1611

cellulose derivatives, which is water swellable polymer, combined with polymer selected from polyacrylic acid or polyvinyl pyrrolidone, which is water soluble polymer (page 5, lines 20-27; page 10, line 14 till page 11 line 12; page 17, lines 25-28; examples 11 and 12). The adhesive layer further comprises polyethylene glycol, dihydroxy-polyethylene glycol and butylene glycol up to 20%, which are the claimed oligomers (page 13, lines 10-14; page 14, lines 21-24; page 20, lines 5-11). Oligomer are expected to have the capability of hydrogen and electrostatic bonding to the hydrophilic polymer since compounds and their properties are inseparable. Example 37 teaches gel composition. The residence time of the device can be adjusted by adjusting the polymer components of the backing depending on the desired timing of the delivery of the chosen pharmaceutical and carrier (page 9, lines 12-31). The device absorbs water (page 9, lines 26-29), i.e. capable to form hydrogel. The residence time is modulated between about few seconds to about few days, and preferably between 30 minutes and 24 hours, and more preferably between about 1 hour to about 8 hours (page 10, lines 1-6). The adhesive layer containing the active agent will erode first and the backing layer will have slower erosion time as it provides protection to the drug containing layer (page 10, lines 7-13). The device may have additional layer to ensure unidirectional release of the active agent (page 19, lines 3-6).

Finding of Prima Facie Obviousness Rational and Motivation
(MPEP §2142-2143)

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to white teeth using a device comprising an erodible backing and whitening-agent-containing layer as taught by Ye, and replace whitening-agent-containing layer with the composition taught by Tapolsky comprising water swellable polymer, hydrophilic polymer and oligomer to deliver the teeth whitening agent. One would have been motivated to do so because Tapolsky teaches that such a composition is completely erodible and the kinetics of erodability of the composition are easily adjusted by varying the components and can be modulated between about few seconds to about few days. One would reasonably expect whitening the teeth using a device comprising an erodible backing and teeth-whitening-containing layer comprising water swellable polymer, hydrophilic polymer and oligomer wherein the device is completely erodible and its erodability is easily modulated between about few seconds to about few days to achieve the desired teeth whitening effect in the desired time.

Regarding the capability of oligomer of hydrogen and electrostatic bonding to the hydrophilic polymer as claimed by claim 50, this is an intrinsic property since compounds and their properties are inseparable.

Regarding application of the composition and the backing in subsequent steps as claimed by claim 53, applicants failed to provide unexpected results obtained from subsequent application over the single step application taught by the prior art.

Regarding the predetermined period of time to achieve teeth whitening as claimed by claims 56-58, those of ordinary skill in the art would have been readily optimized the period of administration based on the dosages of whitening agent used.

Art Unit: 1611

Doses and administration regimens can be determined by good medical practice and the clinical condition of the individual patient. Determination of the appropriate dosage for treatment involving the above mentioned formulation would have been routinely made by those of ordinary skill in the art and is within the ability of tasks routinely performed by them without undue experimentation.

One would have been motivated to combine these references and make the modification because they are drawn to same technical fields (constituted with same ingredients and share common utilities), and pertinent to the problem which applicant concerns about. MPEP 2141.01(a)

Absent any evidence to the contrary, and based upon the teachings of the prior art, there would have been a reasonable expectation of success in practicing the instantly claimed invention. Therefore, the invention as a whole would have been prima facie obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made.

Response to Arguments

13. Applicant's arguments filed 06/03/2011 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant's arguments filed 06/03/2011 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicants traverse the combination of Tapolsky with Roreger, with or without Ye, and the combination of Tapolsky with Ye by arguing that the claimed feature of backing layer that erodes at a slower rate than the hydrogel is not taught by Tapolsky or Roreger, with or without Ye, nor by the combination of Tapolsky and Ye. Tapolsky

Art Unit: 1611

contemplates that the backing layer erodes before the adhesive layer, exactly the opposite to the present claims. No motivation to modify the backing layer to have slower erosion rate of the backing more than the adhesive. Applicants further argue that Tapolsky teaches not more than 20% PEG.

In response to these arguments, the examiner does not necessary agree with applicants that Tapolsky does not teach backing layer that erodes slower than the adhesive layer, however, the reference clearly teach protection of the adhesive layer. In page 10, lines 7-13 of Tapolsky, the reference teaches:

"In one embodiment, the present invention comprises a film disc having an adhesive layer and a non-adhesive backing layer which can be comprised of components having a similar or different hydrophilicity. The pharmaceutical component may be included in either layer, although preferably, it is included in the adhesive layer, which is closest to the treatment site and which will have a slower erosion time, given that the backing layer protects the interior, **adhesive layer and will typically erode first.**"

It is further argued that, Tapolsky teaches two layers having different erosion time, and teaches that the kinetics of erodability are easily adjusted by varying the layer numbers or components and teaches the same materials of the adhesive and the backing layer as instantly claimed. One having ordinary skill in the art desired to protect the adhesive layer containing the active agent till completely eroded may manipulate erodability of the backing layer to extend erosion time of such a backing layer. In any event, it has been held that mere duplication of parts, reversal or rearrangement of parts was held to be an obvious expedient. *In re Gazda*, 219 F.2d 449, 104 USPQ 400 (CCPA 1955); *In re Japikse*, 181 F.2d 1019, 86 USPQ 70 (CCPA 1950); *In re Kuhle*, 526 F.2d 553, 188 USPQ 7 (CCPA 1975); *In re Harza*, 274 F.2d 449, 104 USPQ 400 (CCPA 1955). Based on the intended use and site of application of the composition one

Art Unit: 1611

would adjust the erodability of the backing as taught by Topolsky. The device taught by Tapolsky is capable to perform the same function as instantly claimed, which is delivery of active agents to the mucosa of the mouth. Roreger is relied upon for teaching translucent polymer composition containing active agent and water swellable polymer such as Eudragit E 100 or Eudragit S 100, PVP and polyethylene glycol. Ye is relied upon for teaching teeth whitening performed by using device having erodible backing applied to the surface of the teeth because such a device is very convenient to the consumer and provides added safety during overnight use.

Regarding the amount of PEG, applicants admits that the Tapolsky teaches not more than 20%, and applicants attention is directed to the present claim 21 that recites 10-50% complementary oligomer, which overlaps with the concentration taught by the reference. It has been held that where the claimed ranges overlap or lie inside ranges disclosed by the prior art, a prima facie case of obviousness exists. *In re Wertheim*, 541 F.2d 257, 191 USPQ 90 (CCPA 1976); *In re Woodruff*, 919 F.2d 1575, 16 USPQ2d 1934 (Fed. Cir. 1990). It has been further held that a prima facie case of obviousness exists where the claimed ranges and the prior art ranges do not overlap but are close enough that one skilled in the art would have expected them to have the same properties. *Titanium Meals Corp. of America v. Banner*, 778 F2d 775, 227 USPQ 773 (Fed. Cir. 1985).

It is well established that the claims are given the broadest interpretation during examination. A conclusion of obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103 (a) does not require absolute predictability, only a reasonable expectation of success; and references are

Art Unit: 1611

evaluated by what they suggest to one versed in the art, rather than by their specific disclosure. *In re Bozek*, 163 USPQ 545 (CCPA 1969).

In the light of the foregoing discussion, the Examiner's ultimate legal conclusion is that the subject matter as a whole as defined by the claims would have been prima facie obvious within the meaning of 35 U.S.C. 103 (a).

Conclusion

14. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

15. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Isis Ghali whose telephone number is (571)272-0595. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday, 6:30 AM to 5:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Sharmila Landau can be reached on (571) 272-0614. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Isis A Ghali/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1611

IG